

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 27, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 27, 2007. Claims 1, 6, 12-13 and 15-17 have been amended to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Claims 11 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

The Examiner has indicated in the Summary section of the Office Action that claims 9 and 18-25 are withdrawn. Yet, on page 2, second paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 9 and 17-20 have been withdrawn. Further, Applicants note that claim 17 has been rejected in the Office Action. Clarification from the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner takes the position that claim 6 recites a seismic cable and yet claim 1, from which claim 6 depends, does not recite a seismic cable. The Examiner notes that claim 1 recites a line network and it is unclear to the Examiner whether the line network is the same as a seismic cable. Accordingly, claim 6 has been amended to replace the "seismic cable" limitation with "line network". Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner further states that claims 14-17 recite the limitation "wherein the synchronization service" and yet claim 13, from which claims 14-17 depend, does not require the system to include a synchronization service. Claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Claims 15-17 have been amended to depend from claim 1, which provides antecedent basis for the limitations recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Eos Tans. AGU Fall Meeting, 2001 by Johnson ("Johnson"). Johnson is generally directed to a seismic network IP numbering scheme. However, Johnson does not teach or disclose a synchronization service for synchronizing a plurality of clocks for the data collection system, the router, the data source nodes, and the seismic data sources. The terms "synchronization" or "clocks" are not even mentioned in Johnson. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Johnson. Claims 2-5, 10 and 12-13 are also patentable over Johnson since they depend from claim 1. Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of US Patent No. 4885724 (Read). Neither Johnson nor Read, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses a synchronization service for synchronizing a plurality of clocks for the data collection system, the router, the data source nodes, and the seismic data sources, as recited in amended claim 1. Since claims 6-8 depend from claim 1 and since neither Johnson nor Read, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 6-8 are therefore also patentable over Johnson and Read.

Claims 14-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of US Publication No. 20020136335 (Liou). Claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Neither Johnson nor Liou, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses a synchronization service for synchronizing a plurality of clocks for the data collection system, the router, the data source nodes, and the seismic data sources, as recited in amended claim 1. Since claims 15-17 depend from claim 1 and since neither Johnson nor Liou, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 15-17 are therefore also patentable over Johnson and Liou.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/ January 16, 2008

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

PRAMUDJI WENDT & TRAN, LLP

1800 Bering, Suite 540

Houston, Texas 77057

Telephone: (713) 468-4600

Facsimile: (713) 980-9882

Attorney for Assignee